

REMARKS

The Office Action dated June 1, 2004 has been received and carefully considered. Claims 1, 36-46, 48, 49, 51 and 52 have been added. Support for the amendments to the claims may be found in the specification and figures as originally filed and no new matter is introduced by these amendments. Reconsideration of the outstanding objections and rejections in the present application therefore is respectfully requested based on the following remarks.

Objection to Claims 49 and 52

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 49 and 52 were objected to for various informalities. The Applicants have amended these claims in view of the Examiner's remarks. Withdrawal of this objection therefore is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 42-47

At page 2 of the Office Action, claims 42-47 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haartsen (U.S. Patent No. 6,393,007) in view of Persson (U.S. Patent No. 5,537,434). This rejection is respectfully traversed with amendment.

Claim 42, from which claims 43-47 depend, has been amended to recite, in part, the limitations of transmitting voice information from a first transceiving unit over a first *dedicated* set of time slots associated with a first plurality of time frames of a wireless channel and transmitting data information from the first transceiving unit over a second *dedicated* set of time slots associated with the first plurality of time frames of a wireless channel. The Examiner asserts that Haartsen discloses transmitting voice information over a first set of time slots (slots 1, 2 and 3 of Figure 4 of Haartsen) associated with a first time frame (hop k frame) and transmitting data information over a second set of time slots (slots 8-11 of Figure 4 of Haartsen) associated with the first time frame. Office Action, p. 3. However, it is respectfully submitted that Haartsen fails to disclose or suggest the limitations of the transmission of voice information over a *dedicated set* of time slots as presently recited in claim 42. Instead, Haartsen teaches a technique "wherein a time slot of a frame hops in position between sequential frames." *Haartsen*, Abstract. *See also Haartsen*, Fig. 4. The Office Action fails to establish that Persson discloses

or suggests at least these limitations. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Office Action fails to establish that the proposed combination of Haartsen and Persson discloses or suggest each and every limitation of claim 42, as well as claims 43-47 at least by virtue of their dependency from claim 42.

Additionally, claim 42 recites the limitations of changing a transmit frequency of the wireless channel in a pseudo random manner. The Examiner cites the passage at col. 9, lines 5-20 of Persson as allegedly disclosing these limitations and asserts that “[t]hose of skill in the art would have been motivated by Persson et al to change a carrier frequency in a pseudo random manner to increase security of transmission.” Office Action, p. 3. The Applicants respectfully submit that the cited passage of Persson provides no mention that the carrier frequency change is performed pseudo randomly for security purposes and therefore respectfully submit that the cited passage of Persson would not motivate one of ordinary skill in the art “to change a carrier frequency in a pseudo random manner to increase security of transmission” as the Examiner suggests. Moreover, even if, *arguendo*, Persson teaches pseudo random carrier frequency changes for the purpose of increased transmission security, the Office Action fails to establish that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to modify the technique of Haartsen as the cited passages of Haartsen provide no mention of a desire for transmission security. Accordingly, the Applicants respectfully submit that the Office Action fails to establish that one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to combine Haartsen and Persson as proposed.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claims 42-47 is improper at this time and withdrawal of this rejection therefore is respectfully requested.

Obviousness Rejection of Claims 1-6, 25, 29, 36-41 and 48-52

At page 4 of the Office Action, claims 1-6, 25, 29, 36-41 and 48-52 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Haartsen in view of Persson and further in view of Dent (U.S. Patent No. 6,181,920). This rejection is respectfully traversed with amendment.

Claim 1, from which claims 2-6 and 25, has been amended to recite, in part, the limitations of a first transceiving unit operable to wirelessly transmit voice information first

dedicated set of time slots of a plurality of time frames and data information over a *second dedicated set of time slots* of the plurality of time frames. Claim 1 further recites the limitations of a carrier frequency of a channel comprising the plurality of time frames changes in a pseudo random manner. Claim 36, from which claims 29 and 37-41 depend, claim 48, from which claims 49-51 depend, and claim 52 recite similar limitations. As noted above, the Office Action fails to establish that Haartsen or Persson, alone or in combination, disclose or suggest at least these limitations and that there is motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Haartsen and Persson as proposed. The Office Action also fails to establish that Dent discloses or suggests at least these limitations. Accordingly, the Office Action fails to establish that the proposed combination of Haartsen, Persson and Dent disclose or suggest each and every limitation of claims 1, 36, 48 and 52, as well as claims 2-6, 25, 29, 37-41 and 49-51 at least by virtue of their dependency from one of claims 1, 36, 48 and 52. Moreover, these dependent claims recite additional limitations neither disclosed nor suggested by the cited references.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the obviousness rejection of claims 1-6, 25, 29, 36-41 and 48-52 is improper at this time and withdrawal of this rejection therefore is respectfully requested.


Conclusion

The Applicants respectfully submit that the present application is in condition for allowance, and an early indication of the same is courteously solicited. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone at the below listed telephone number in order to expedite resolution of any issues and to expedite passage of the present application to issue, if any comments, questions, or suggestions arise in connection with the present application.

The Applicants do not believe that any additional fees are due, but if the Commissioner believes additional fees are due, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees which may be required, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account Number 01-0365.

Respectfully submitted,

August 24, 2004
Date



Ryan S. Davidson, Reg. No. 51,596,
On Behalf Of

J. Gustav Larson, Reg. No. 39,263,
Attorney for Applicant(s)

TOLER, LARSON & ABEL, L.L.P.

5000 Plaza On The Lake, Suite 265

Austin, Texas 78746

(512) 327-5515 (phone) (512) 327-5452 (fax)